



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,704	07/12/2001	Anthony Scott Moran	AUS920010409US1	9196

7590

08/09/2005

Robert H. Frantz
P.O. Box 23324
Oklahoma City, OK 73123-2334

EXAMINER

ABRISHAMKAR, KAVEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/903,704

Applicant(s)

MORAN ET AL.

Examiner

Kaveh Abrishamkar

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/27/2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on April 27, 2005.

Claims 1-24 were originally received for consideration. Per the received amendment, claims 1,3,4,7-9, 11-12, 15-21, and 24 are amended. Claims 1-24 are currently being considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 1-8 and 17-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims delineate a method that is not tangibly embodied on a computer-readable medium.
4. Claims 4-8 are under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims delineate a method that is not tangibly embodied on a computer-readable medium.
5. Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are function descriptive material per se. Data structures not claimed as embodied on a computer-readable medium are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing a functional change in the computer.

Art Unit: 2131

6. Claims 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are functional descriptive material per se. Data structures not claimed as embodied on a computer-readable medium are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing a functional change in the computer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Icken et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,816,906).

Regarding claim 1, Icken discloses:

A method for extending and grouping actions and permissions for authorization of a requesting user to access or use a requested protected system resource in a computer system, said method comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2131

providing an access control policy (column 2 lines 58-60) associated with said requested protected system resource, said access control policy containing a permission list of permitted identities (column 2 lines 20-35) for use of said protected system resource, and at least one action group tag and associated action indicators (column 4 lines 40-48);

reusing a finite quantity of action indicators among a plurality of action group tags to control a number of unique permissions less than or equal to the product of the quantity of allowable action indicators and a quantity of allowable action group tags (column 4 lines 33-55), wherein a group of users can be assigned the same group tag which determines the permissions that the group is allowed such as accessing authoring materials at different geographic locations;

evaluating said permission list according to a specific permission definition associated with said action group tag, said permission definition providing a correlation between permissible actions and members of a set of action indicators (column 4 lines 33-55), wherein the attribute value (group tag) imparts specific types of authority to users; and

granting authorization to perform actions on said requested protected system resource to said requesting user if said access control policy permission list includes an appropriate action indicator correlated to an action group tag (column 4 lines 33-59).

Claim 2 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Icken discloses:

Art Unit: 2131

The method as set forth in claim 1 further comprising providing in an access control policy permission list a plurality of action group tags, each action group tag having one or more associated action indicators, such that resultant granting of authorization to act on said requested protected object is completed if the requested action is allowed by any of the associated action indicators of any of the action groups (column 4 lines 33-59).

Claim 3 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 2. Furthermore, Icken discloses:

The method as set forth in claim 1, wherein said requested protected system resource comprises a computer file sent to a local computer from a remote computer over a computer network (column 4 lines 48-55).

Regarding claim 4, Icken discloses:

A method for managing permission indicators for computer system protected objects comprising the steps of:

providing a plurality of permission indicator containers in an access control list (column 2 lines 20-35);

associating a first set of permission indicators with a primary permission indicator container (column 4 lines 40-48); and

associating one or more additional sets of permission indicators with additional permission indicator containers (column 4 lines 40-48), wherein said permission indicators are reused among said containers such that permission

Art Unit: 2131

indicators may be categorized and grouped logically to control a number of unique permissions less than or equal to the product of a quantity of allowable action indicators and a quantity of allowable action group tags (column 4 lines 33-55), wherein a group of users can be assigned the same group tag which determines the permissions that the group is allowed such as accessing authoring materials at different geographic locations.

Claim 5 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 4. Furthermore, Icken discloses:

The method as set forth in claim 4 wherein said step of providing a first set of permission indicators comprises providing at least one other (additional) permission indicator set having equivalent permission indicators to said first set such that permission indicators may be assigned unique permissive control according to a permission indicator container with which they are associated (column 4 lines 40-48).

Claim 6 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Icken discloses:

The method as set forth in claim 5 wherein said step of providing an equivalent set of permission indicators comprises providing the characters "a" through "z" and "A" through "Z" as permission indicators (column 2 lines 23-44), wherein the Userid and the table of constants are interpreted as using letter of either case as indicators.

Art Unit: 2131

Claim 7 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 4. Furthermore, Icken discloses:

The method as set forth in claim 4 further comprising associating an action group tag with a permission indicator container (column 4 lines 40-48).

Claim 8 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 7. Furthermore, Icken discloses:

The method as set forth in claim 7 further comprising the step of providing an action group tag with an associated list of permission indicators in an access control list entry (column 2 lines 20-35).

Regarding claim 9, Icken discloses:

A computer readable medium encoded with software or extending and grouping actions and permissions for authorization of a requesting user to access or use a requested protected system resource in a computer system, said software performing steps comprising:

providing an access control policy (column 2 lines 58-60) associated with said requested protected system resource containing a permission list of permitted identities (column 2 lines 20-35) and at least one action group tag with associated action indicators (column 4 lines 40-48);

reusing a finite quantity of action indicators among a plurality of action group tags to control a number of unique permissions less than or equal to the

Art Unit: 2131

product of the quantity of allowable action indicators and a quantity of allowable action group tags (column 4 lines 33-55), wherein a group of users can be assigned the same group tag which determines the permissions that the group is allowed such as accessing authoring materials at different geographic locations;

evaluating said permission list according to a specific permission definition associated with said action group tag, said permission definition providing a correlation between members of a set of action indicators (column 4 lines 33-55), wherein the attribute value (group tag) imparts specific types of authority to users; and

granting authorization to perform actions on said requested protected system resource to said requesting user if said access control policy permission list includes an appropriate action indicator correlated to an action group tag (column 4 lines 33-59).

Claim 10 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 9. Furthermore, Icken discloses:

The computer readable medium as set forth in claim 9 further comprising software for providing in an access control policy permission list a plurality of action group tags, each action group tag having one or more associated action indicators, such that resultant granting of authorization to act on said requested protected object is completed if the requested action is allowed by any of the associated action indicators of any of the action groups (column 4 lines 33-59).

Art Unit: 2131

Claim 11 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 9. Furthermore, Icken discloses:

The computer readable medium as set forth in claim 9 wherein said requested protected system resource comprises a computer file sent to a local computer from a remote computer over a computer network (column 4 lines 48-55).

Regarding claim 12, Icken discloses:

A computer readable medium encoded with software for managing permission indicators for computer system protected objects, said software performing the steps of:

providing a plurality of permission indicator containers in an access control list (column 2 lines 20-35);

associating a first set of permission indicators with a primary permission indicator container (column 4 lines 40-48); and

associating one or more additional sets of permission indicators with additional permission indicator containers (column 4 lines 40-48), wherein said permission indicators are reused among said containers such that permission indicators may be categorized and grouped logically to control a number of unique permissions less than or equal to the product of a quantity of allowable action indicators and a quantity of allowable action group tags (column 4 lines 33-55), wherein a group of users can be assigned the same group tag which

Art Unit: 2131

determines the permissions that the group is allowed such as accessing authoring materials at different geographic locations.

Claim 13 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Icken discloses:

The computer readable medium as set forth in claim 12 wherein said software for providing a first set of permission indicators comprises software for providing permission indicators which are equivalent to at least one other (additional) permission indicators such that permission indicators may be assigned unique permissive control according to a permission indicator container with which they are associated (column 4 lines 40-48).

Claim 14 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 13. Furthermore, Icken discloses:

The computer readable medium as set forth in claim 13 wherein said software for providing equivalent permission indicators comprises software for providing a set of permission indicators including the characters "a" through "z" and "A" through "Z" (column 2 lines 23-44), wherein the Userid and the table of constants are interpreted as using letter of either case as indicators.

Claim 15 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Icken discloses:

Art Unit: 2131

The computer readable medium as set forth in claim 12 further comprising software for associating an action group tag with a permission indicator container (column 4 lines 40-48).

Claim 16 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 15. Furthermore, Icken discloses:

The computer readable medium as set forth in claim 15 further comprising software for providing an action group tag with an associated list of permission indicators in an access control list entry (column 2 lines 20-35).

Regarding claim 17, Icken discloses:

An authorization system for extending and grouping actions and permissions for authorization of a requesting user to access or use a requested protected system resource in a computer system, said system comprising:

an access control policy (column 2 lines 58-60) associated with said requested protected system resource, having a permission list of permitted identities (column 2 lines 20-35) and at least one action group tag with associated action indicators wherein a finite quantity of action indicators are reused among a plurality of action group tags to control a number of unique permissions less than or equal to the product of the quantity of allowable action indicators and a quantity of allowable action group tags (column 4 lines 33-55), wherein a group of users can be assigned the same group tag which determines

Art Unit: 2131

the permissions that the group is allowed such as accessing authoring materials at different geographic locations;

a permission list evaluator for evaluating an access control policy permission list according to a specific permission definition associated with said action group tag, said permission definition providing a correlation between members of a set of action indicators (column 4 lines 33-55), wherein the attribute value (group tag) imparts specific types of authority to users; and

an authorization grantor adapted to grant authorization to perform actions on said requested protected system resource to said requesting user if said access control policy permission list includes an appropriate action indicator correlated to an action group tag (column 4 lines 33-59).

Claim 18 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 17. Furthermore, Icken discloses:

The system as set forth in claim 17 further wherein said access control policy permission list comprises a plurality of action group tags, each action group tag having one or more associated action indicators, such that resultant granting of authorization to act on said requested protected object is completed if the requested action is allowed by any of the associated action indicators of any of the action groups (column 4 lines 33-59).

Claim 19 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 17. Furthermore, Icken discloses:

Art Unit: 2131

The system as set forth in Claim 17 wherein the requested protected system resource comprises a computer file sent to a local computer from a remote computer over a computer network (column 4 lines 48-55).

Regarding claim 20, Icken discloses:

A system for managing permission indicators for computer system protected objects comprising:

a plurality of permission indicator containers for an access control list (column 2 lines 20-35);

a first set of permission indicators associated with a primary permission indicator container (column 4 lines 40-48); and

one or more additional sets of permission indicators (column 4 lines 40-48) associated with additional permission indicator containers, wherein such permission indicators are reused among said containers such that permission indicators are categorized and grouped logically to control a number of unique permissions less than or equal to the product of a quantity of allowable action indicators and a quantity of allowable action group tags (column 4 lines 33-55), wherein a group of users can be assigned the same group tag which determines the permissions that the group is allowed such as accessing authoring materials at different geographic locations.

Claim 21 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 20. Furthermore, Icken discloses:

Art Unit: 2131

The system as set forth in claim 20 wherein said a first set of permission indicators and at least one other (additional) permission indicator set are equivalent permission indicators such that permission indicators are assigned unique permissive control according to the permission indicator container with which they are associated (column 4 lines 40-48).

Claim 22 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 21. Furthermore, Icken discloses:

The system as set forth in claim 21 wherein said equivalent set of permission indicators comprises the characters "a" through "z" and "A" through "Z" (column 2 lines 23-44), wherein the Userid and the table of constants are interpreted as using letter of either case as indicators.

Claim 23 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 20. Furthermore, Icken discloses:

The system as set forth in claim 20 further comprising an action group tag associated with a permission indicator container (column 4 lines 40-48).

Claim 24 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 23. Furthermore, Icken discloses:

The system as set forth in claim 23 further comprising an action group tag associated with a list of permission indicators in an access control list entry

Art Unit: 2131

(column 2 lines 20-35).


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaveh Abrishamkar whose telephone number is 571-272-3786. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KA
08/04/05


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100